PROPOSED RULE MAKING



Agency: Department of Ecology AO # 18-02

CR-102 (December 2017) (Implements RCW 34.05.320)

Do NOT use for expedited rule making

CODE REVISER USE ONLY

OFFICE OF THE CODE REVISER STATE OF WASHINGTON FILED

DATE: March 12, 2019

TIME: 3:01 PM

WSR 19-07-024

☐ Supplemental No	tice to WSR		
☐ Continuance of V	VSR		
	ement of Inqu	uiry was filed as WSR 18-14	4- <u>011</u> ; or
☐ Expedited Rule N	lakingProp	osed notice was filed as WS	SR; or
☐ Proposal is exem	pt under RC	W 34.05.310(4) or 34.05.330	(1); or
☐ Proposal is exem	pt under RC	W	
Chapter 173-230 WA	C Certification	n of Operators of Wastewater	ect) The Department of Ecology is proposing to amend Treatment Plants. This Chapter establishes the Ecology's ons for wastewater treatment plants in Washington State.
			y.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Laws-rules-
rulemaking/Rulemaki		230	
Hearing location(s): Date:	Time:	Location: (be specific)	Comment:
April 23, 2019	1:30 PM	, , ,	
Арпі 23, 2019	1:30 PM	Dept. of Ecology 300 Desmond Dr. SE Lacey, WA 98503	Presentation, question and answer session followed by the hearing.
April 23, 2019	6:00 PM	Webinar Only	Presentation, question and answer session followed by the hearing.
			This is an online meeting that you can attend from any computer using internet access.
			Join online and see instructions:
			https://watech.webex.com/watech/onstage/g.php?M
			TID=e65e84fe0507801453a6344d81cb21fe6
April 25, 2019	10:00 AM	Moses Lake Civic Center 401 South Balsam ST. Moses Lake, WA 98837	Presentation, question and answer session followed by the hearing.
Date of intended add	option: On		ote: This is NOT the effective date)
Submit written com	ments to:		
Name: Jocelyn Jones	3		
[Water Qua PO Box 47	nt of Ecology ality Program]		
Or, Send parce	el delivery ser	vices to:	

Department of Ecology [Water Quality Program] 300 Desmond Dr. ŠE, Lacey, WA 98503 Email: Submit comments by mail, online, or at the hearing(s). Fax: N/A Other: Online: http://ws.ecology.commentinput.com/?id=gPMjY By (date) May 1, 2019 Assistance for persons with disabilities: Contact Teresa Reno Phone: 360-407-7285 Fax: N/A TTY: People with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-6341. People with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay Service at 711. Email: Teresa.Reno@ecv.wa.gov Other: N/A By (date) April 15, 2019 Purpose of the proposal and its anticipated effects, including any changes in existing rules: Legislation passed in 2018 amending Chapter 70.95B RCW (Chapter 213, Laws of 2018) directing Ecology, with the advice of an advisory committee, to establish an initial fee schedule in rule. This rulemaking does this as well as other necessary updates to modernize and make more clear the requirements and the procedures for obtaining and maintaining an operator certification in Washington State. As part of this rulemaking we have focused on the following changes: Establishing a new fee schedule as directed by the Legislature in 2018. Providing for an Operator in Training and respective education and experience qualifications for groups II-IV. Updating rule language to acknowledge new technologies in wastewater treatment. Reorganizing the Rule to create standalone sections where more information and clarity are needed. Clarifying rule language to codify existing program practices. The main anticipated effect of this rulemaking will be the establishment of a fee schedule in rule that fully funds the Operator Certification Program as directed by the Legislature. The anticipated effects of the other changes proposed include less confusion over requirements and an increase in opportunities for Operators in Training due to the creation of new Operator In Training group levels Reasons supporting proposal: See answer to "Purpose of the proposal..." Statutory authority for adoption: RCW 70.95B Domestic Waste Treatment Plants - Operators Statute being implemented: RCW 70.95B Domestic Waste Treatment Plants - Operators Is rule necessary because of a: Federal Law? ☐ Yes ⋈ No Federal Court Decision? ☐ Yes ⊠ No State Court Decision? ⊠ No ☐ Yes If yes, CITATION: Agency comments or recommendations, if any, as to statutory language, implementation, enforcement, and fiscal matters: N/A

Name of proponent: (person or organization) Department of Ecology					
			□ Public		
			⊠ Governmental		
Name of agency	personnel responsible for:				
Name		Office Location	Phone		
Drafting:	Poppy Carre & Jocelyn Jones	Lacey	360-407-6321		
Implementation:	Heather Bartlett Lacey 360-407-640				
Enforcement:	Heather Bartlett	Lacey	360-406-6405		
Is a school district If yes, insert stater	-	uired under RCW 28A.305.135?	☐ Yes ⊠ No		
The public may obtain a copy of the school district fiscal impact statement by contacting: Name: N/A Address: N/A Phone: N/A Fax: N/A TTY: N/A Email: N/A Other: N/A					
Is a cost-benefit a	analysis required under RCW :	34.05.328?			
 ✓ Yes: A pre Name: J. Address: Phone: 3 Fax: N/A TTY: Per Washing Email: Jo Other: No: Pleas 	liminary cost-benefit analysis ma ocelyn W. Jones : PO Box 47600 Olympia, WA 98504-7600 360-407-6321 cople with speech disability may of ton Relay Service at 711. ocelyn.jones@ecy.wa.gov		· ·		
		y be exempt from requirements of the Regulatory F			
	W). Please check the box for any		alliless Act (see		
adopted solely to description this rule adopted. Citation and descr ☐ This rule propodefined by RCW 3	conform and/or comply with fede is being adopted to conform or iption: esal, or portions of the proposal, 4.05.313 before filing the notice isal, or portions of the proposal,	is exempt under RCW 19.85.061 because this rule is ral statute or regulations. Please cite the specific feet comply with, and describe the consequences to the is exempt because the agency has completed the pof this proposed rule. is exempt under the provisions of RCW 15.65.570(2)	deral statute or state if the rule is not ilot rule process		

Explanation of exemptions, if necessary: Based on the analysis in chapters 1-5 of the Preliminary Regulatory Analyse for this rulemaking, the proposed amendments only impose compliance costs on operators. Those costs are: Increased application fees. Increased renewal fees. Potential time costs for operators and operators in training (OITs) with experience not under the direction or supervision of a fully certified operator. Operators are private individuals, though they may be currently employed by WWTPs. Certifications, however, do not belong to the WWTP, but to the operator or OIT. Based on analysis of the proposed rule amendments, we do not expect WWTPs to incur compliance costs under the proposed amendments, as compared to the baseline. The Regulatory Fairness Act, in RCW 19.85.030, states: "In the adoption of a rule under chapter 34.05 RCW, an agency shall prepare a small business economic impact statement: (i) If the proposed rule will impose more than minor costs on businesses in an industry; or (ii) if requested to do so by a majority vote of the joint administrative rules review committee within forty-five days of receiving the notice of proposed rule making under RCW (34.05.320(1)(a)." The entities that would incur compliance costs are not businesses, so we conclude there are no pusinesses incurring additional costs under the proposed amendments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the requirements of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES			empt under F	CW 19.85.025(3). Check all that apply:
(Internal government operations) (Dictated by statute) RCW 34.05.310 (4)(c)				RCW 34.05.310 (4)(e)
 RCW 34.05.310 (4)(c) (Incorporation by reference) RCW 34.05.310 (4)(f) (Set or adjust fees) RCW 34.05.310 (4)(g) (Correct or clarify language) This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW 19.85.025(4). Explanation of exemptions, if necessary: Based on the analysis in chapters 1-5 of the Preliminary Regulatory Analyse or this rulemaking, the proposed amendments only impose compliance costs on operators. Those costs are: Increased application fees. Increased application fees. Potential time costs for operators and operators in training (OITs) with experience not under the direction or supervision of a fully certified operator. Operators are private individuals, though they may be currently employed by WWTPs. Certifications, however, donot belong to the WWTP, but to the operator or OIT. Based on analysis of the proposed rule amendments, we do not expect WWTPs to incur compliance costs under the proposed amendments, as compared to the baseline. The Regulatory Fairness Act, in RCW 19.85.030, states: "In the adoption of a rule under chapter 34.05 RCW, an agency shall prepare a small business economic impact statement: (i) If the proposed rule will impose more than minor costs on businesses in an industry; or (ii) if requested to do so by a majority vote of the joint administrativules review committee within forty-five days of receiving the notice of proposed rule making under RCW 34.05.320(1)(a)." The entities that would incur compliance costs are not businesses, so we conclude there are no pusinesses incurring additional costs under the proposed amendments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the requirements of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES f the proposed rule is not exempt, does it impose more-tha		. , ,		
(Incorporation by reference) RCW 34.05.310 (4)(d) RCW 34.05.310 (4)(d) RCW 34.05.310 (4)(d) RCW 34.05.310 (4)(d) RCW 34.05.310 (4)(g) ((i) Relating to agency hearings; or (ii) process requirements for applying to an agency for a license or permit) This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW 19.85.025(4). Explanation of exemptions, if necessary: Based on the analysis in chapters 1-5 of the Preliminary Regulatory Analyse for this rulemaking, the proposed amendments only impose compliance costs on operators. Those costs are: Increased application fees. Increased renewal fees. Potential time costs for operators and operators in training (OITs) with experience not under the direction or supervision of a fully certified operator. Departors are private individuals, though they may be currently employed by WWTPs. Certifications, however, don't belong to the WWTP, but to the operator or OIT. Based on analysis of the proposed rule amendments, we don't expect WWTPs to incur compliance costs under the proposed amendments, as compared to the baseline. The Regulatory Fairness Act, in RCW 19.85.030, states: "In the adoption of a rule under chapter 34.05 RCW, an agency shall prepare a small business economic impact statement: (i) If the proposed rule will impose more than minor costs on businesses in an industry; or (ii) If requested to do so by a majority vote of the joint administrative rules review committee within forty-five days of receiving the notice of proposed rule making under RCW 34.05.320(1)(a)." The entities that would incur compliance costs are not businesses, so we conclude there are no businesses incurring additional costs under the proposed amendments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the requirements of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES If the proposed rule is not exempt, does it impose more-than-minor costs were calculated. Briefly summarize the agency's analysis showing how costs were calculated.	_	, , ,		,
RCW 34.05.310 (4)(d)		, , ,	_	
(Correct or clarify language) ((ii) Relating to agency hearings; or (iii) process requirements for applying to an agency for a license or permit) This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW 19.85.025(4). Explanation of exemptions, if necessary: Based on the analysis in chapters 1-5 of the Preliminary Regulatory Analyse for this rulemaking, the proposed amendments only impose compliance costs on operators. Those costs are: Increased application fees. Increased renewal fees. Potential time costs for operators and operators in training (OITs) with experience not under the direction or supervision of a fully certified operator. Operators are private individuals, though they may be currently employed by WWTPs. Certifications, however, do not belong to the WWTP, but to the operator or OIT. Based on analysis of the proposed rule amendments, we do not expect WWTPs to incur compliance costs under the proposed amendments, as compared to the baseline. The Regulatory Fairness Act, in RCW 19.85.030, states: "In the adoption of a rule under chapter 34.05 RCW, an agency shall prepare a small business economic impact statement: (i) If the proposed rule will impose more than minor costs on businesses in an industry; or (ii) if requested to do so by a majority vote of the joint administrative rules review committee within forty-five days of receiving the notice of proposed rule making under RCW 34.05.320(1)(a)." The entities that would incur compliance costs are not businesses, so we conclude there are no pusinesses incurring additional costs under the proposed amendments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the requirements of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES It the proposed rule is not exempt, does it impose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses: No Briefly summarize the agency's analysis showing how costs were calculated		,		,
requirements for applying to an agency for a license or permit! ☐ This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW 19.85.025(4). ☐ Explanation of exemptions, if necessary: Based on the analysis in chapters 1-5 of the Preliminary Regulatory Analyse for this rulemaking, the proposed amendments only impose compliance costs on operators. Those costs are: ☐ Increased application fees. ☐ Increased renewal fees. ☐ Potential time costs for operators and operators in training (OITs) with experience not under the direction or supervision of a fully certified operator. ☐ Operators are private individuals, though they may be currently employed by WWTPs. Certifications, however, d not belong to the WWTP, but to the operator or OIT. Based on analysis of the proposed rule amendments, we do not expect WWTPs to incur compliance costs under the proposed amendments, as compared to the baseline. ☐ The Regulatory Fairness Act, in RCW 19.85.030, states: "In the adoption of a rule under chapter 34.05 RCW, an agency shall prepare a small business economic impact statement: (i) If the proposed rule will impose more than minor costs on businesses in an industry; or (ii) if requested to do so by a majority vote of the joint administrative rules review committee within forty-five days of receiving the notice of proposed rule making under RCW 34.05.320(1)(a)." The entities that would incur compliance costs are not businesses, so we conclude there are no pusinesses incurring additional costs under the proposed amendments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the requirements of the RFA for this rulemaking. ☐ COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES f the proposed rule is not exempt, does it impose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses ☐ No Briefly summarize the agency's analysis showing how costs were calculated	_	. , ,		, , , , , ,
This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW 19.85.025(4). This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW 19.85.025(4). This rulemaking, the proposed amendments only impose compliance costs on operators. Those costs are: Increased application fees. Increased renewal fees. Potential time costs for operators and operators in training (OITs) with experience not under the direction or supervision of a fully certified operator. Operators are private individuals, though they may be currently employed by WWTPs. Certifications, however, don't belong to the WWTP, but to the operator or OIT. Based on analysis of the proposed rule amendments, we don't expect WWTPs to incur compliance costs under the proposed amendments, as compared to the baseline. The Regulatory Fairness Act, in RCW 19.85.030, states: "In the adoption of a rule under chapter 34.05 RCW, an agency shall prepare a small business economic impact statement: (i) If the proposed rule will impose more than minor costs on businesses in an industry; or (ii) if requested to do so by a majority vote of the joint administrative rules review committee within forty-five days of receiving the notice of proposed rule making under RCW 84.05.320(1)(a)." The entities that would incur compliance costs are not businesses, so we conclude there are no pusinesses incurring additional costs under the proposed amendments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the requirements of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES If the proposed rule is not exempt, does it impose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses No Briefly summarize the agency's analysis showing how costs were calculated. Yes Calculations show the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business		(conserve conserve congresses)		
Explanation of exemptions, if necessary: Based on the analysis in chapters 1-5 of the Preliminary Regulatory Analyse for this rulemaking, the proposed amendments only impose compliance costs on operators. Those costs are: Increased application fees. Increased renewal fees. Potential time costs for operators and operators in training (OITs) with experience not under the direction or supervision of a fully certified operator. Operators are private individuals, though they may be currently employed by WWTPs. Certifications, however, donot belong to the WWTP, but to the operator or OIT. Based on analysis of the proposed rule amendments, we do not expect WWTPs to incur compliance costs under the proposed amendments, as compared to the baseline. The Regulatory Fairness Act, in RCW 19.85.030, states: "In the adoption of a rule under chapter 34.05 RCW, an agency shall prepare a small business economic impact statement: (i) If the proposed rule will impose more than minor costs on businesses in an industry; or (iii) if requested to do so by a majority vote of the joint administrative rules review committee within forty-five days of receiving the notice of proposed rule making under RCW 34.05.320(1)(a)." The entities that would incur compliance costs are not businesses, so we conclude there are no pusinesses incurring additional costs under the proposed amendments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the requirements of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES If the proposed rule is not exempt, does it impose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses: Description of the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small businesses.				
Explanation of exemptions, if necessary: Based on the analysis in chapters 1-5 of the Preliminary Regulatory Analyse for this rulemaking, the proposed amendments only impose compliance costs on operators. Those costs are: Increased application fees. Increased renewal fees. Potential time costs for operators and operators in training (OITs) with experience not under the direction or supervision of a fully certified operator. Operators are private individuals, though they may be currently employed by WWTPs. Certifications, however, donot belong to the WWTP, but to the operator or OIT. Based on analysis of the proposed rule amendments, we do not expect WWTPs to incur compliance costs under the proposed amendments, as compared to the baseline. The Regulatory Fairness Act, in RCW 19.85.030, states: "In the adoption of a rule under chapter 34.05 RCW, an agency shall prepare a small business economic impact statement: (i) If the proposed rule will impose more than minor costs on businesses in an industry; or (iii) if requested to do so by a majority vote of the joint administrative rules review committee within forty-five days of receiving the notice of proposed rule making under RCW 34.05.320(1)(a)." The entities that would incur compliance costs are not businesses, so we conclude there are no pusinesses incurring additional costs under the proposed amendments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the requirements of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES If the proposed rule is not exempt, does it impose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses: Description of the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small businesses.	⊠ This rule	e proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exe	empt under R	CW 19.85.025(4).
COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES f the proposed rule is not exempt , does it impose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses. \[\begin{align*} \text{No} & Briefly summarize the agency's analysis showing how costs were calculated. \[\text{\tex{	 Inc Poi Operators not belong not expect The Regula agency sha 	reased application fees. reased renewal fees. rential time costs for operators and oper supervision of a fully certified operator. are private individuals, though they may to the WWTP, but to the operator or O WWTPs to incur compliance costs unde	rators in train y be current IT. Based or er the propo ates: "In the apact staten	ining (OITs) with experience not under the direction ly employed by WWTPs. Certifications, however, do analysis of the proposed rule amendments, we do sed amendments, as compared to the baseline. adoption of a rule under chapter 34.05 RCW, an
f the proposed rule is not exempt , does it impose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses. \[\sum \text{No} \] Briefly summarize the agency's analysis showing how costs were calculated \[\sum \text{Yes} \] Calculations show the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business	ules revie 34.05.320 ousinesses	w committee within forty-five days of re (1)(a)." The entities that would incur cor incurring additional costs under the pro	eceiving the mpliance co	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no
 □ No Briefly summarize the agency's analysis showing how costs were calculated. □ Yes Calculations show the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business 	ules revie 34.05.320 ousinesses	w committee within forty-five days of re (1)(a)." The entities that would incur cor incurring additional costs under the pro nts of the RFA for this rulemaking.	eceiving the mpliance co oposed ame	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the
☐ Yes Calculations show the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business	rules revie 34.05.320 ousinesses requireme	w committee within forty-five days of re (1)(a)." The entities that would incur con incurring additional costs under the pronts of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION	eceiving the mpliance co oposed ame	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES
	rules revie 34.05.320 ousinesses requireme	w committee within forty-five days of re (1)(a)." The entities that would incur con incurring additional costs under the pronts of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION	eceiving the mpliance co oposed ame	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES
	rules revie 34.05.320 ousinesses requireme	w committee within forty-five days of res (1)(a)." The entities that would incur consincurring additional costs under the prosts of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTIONS SECTIONS OF THE PROST OF THE	eceiving the mpliance co oposed ame ON ONLY IF e-than-minor	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses?
The public may obtain a copy of the small business economic impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by contacting:	rules revie 34.05.320 businesses requireme f the propo No	w committee within forty-five days of res (1)(a)." The entities that would incur consincurring additional costs under the prosts of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTIONS SECTIONS SECTIONS AND ADDITIONS OF THE PROST OF THE PR	eceiving the mpliance co oposed ame on ONLY IF e-than-minor howing how composes more	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses?
Name: N/A	rules revie 34.05.320 cousinesses requireme f the propo No Yes econom	w committee within forty-five days of res (1)(a)." The entities that would incur consincurring additional costs under the prosts of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTIONS SECTION	eceiving the mpliance copposed ame ON ONLY IF e-than-minor howing how composes more ment here:	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses? costs were calculated e-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business
Address: N/A	rules revies 34.05.320 cousinesses requireme f the propo No Yes econom The proportion	w committee within forty-five days of res (1)(a)." The entities that would incur consincurring additional costs under the prosts of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTIONS SECTION	eceiving the mpliance copposed ame ON ONLY IF e-than-minor howing how composes more ment here:	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses? costs were calculated e-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business
Phone: N/A	rules revies 34.05.320 cousinesses requireme f the propo No Yes econom The propo NA	w committee within forty-five days of restall (1)(a)." The entities that would incur consincurring additional costs under the prosents of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION Seed rule is not exempt, does it impose more allowed by the seed rule is not exempt, does it impose more acting: Calculations show the rule proposal likely it is impact statement is required. Insert statement is required. Insert statement is required. Insert statement is required. Insert statement is required.	eceiving the mpliance copposed ame ON ONLY IF e-than-minor howing how composes more ment here:	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses? costs were calculated e-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business
	rules revies 34.05.320 cousinesses requireme f the propo No Yes econom The propo A P	w committee within forty-five days of restall (1)(a)." The entities that would incur consincurring additional costs under the prosents of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTIONS S	eceiving the mpliance copposed ame ON ONLY IF e-than-minor howing how composes more ment here:	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses? costs were calculated e-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business
TTY: People with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-6341. People with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay Service at 711. To request ADA accommodation for disabilities, or printed materials in a format for the visually	rules revies 34.05.320 cousinesses requireme f the propo No Yes econom The propo No Propo A Propo The propo R A Propo The	w committee within forty-five days of res (1)(a)." The entities that would incur consincurring additional costs under the prost incurring additional costs under the prost of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTIONS S	on ONLY IF e-than-minor howing how of the ment here:	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses? costs were calculated e-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by
impaired, call Ecology at 360-407-7668 or visit https://ecology.wa.gov/accessibility.	rules revies 34.05.320 cousinesses requirement f the propo No Yes econom The propo Reconta	w committee within forty-five days of res (1)(a)." The entities that would incur consincurring additional costs under the prost incurring additional costs under the prost of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTION SECT	eceiving the mpliance copposed ame on ONLY IF e-than-minor nowing how composes more ment here:	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses? costs were calculated e-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by
Email: N/A	rules revies 34.05.320 cousinesses requirement f the propo No Yes econom The propo No Propo Solution of the propo The propo Solution of the propo Solution of the propo The propo The propo Solution of the propo The propo Solution of the propo The propo The propo Solution of the propo Solution of the propo Solution of the propo the propo Soluti	w committee within forty-five days of restable (1)(a)." The entities that would incur consincurring additional costs under the prost of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTIONS and rule is not exempt, does it impose more briefly summarize the agency's analysis should be compacted at the statement is required. Insert statement in the statement is required. Insert statement in the statement is required. Insert st	on ONLY IF e-than-minor howing how of the seconomic at 877-833-634 on for disability	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses? costs were calculated. e-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by 1. People with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay ties, or printed materials in a format for the visually
Other: N/A	rules revies 34.05.320 cousinesses requireme f the propo No Yes econom The propo A P F T Sc in	w committee within forty-five days of restall (1)(a)." The entities that would incur consincurring additional costs under the prost of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTIONS and the second of the RFA for this rulemaking. COMPLETE THIS SECTIONS are the second of the s	on ONLY IF e-than-minor howing how of the seconomic at 877-833-634 on for disability	notice of proposed rule making under RCW sts are not businesses, so we conclude there are no ndments. Ecology is therefore exempt from the NO EXEMPTION APPLIES costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses? costs were calculated. e-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by 1. People with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay ties, or printed materials in a format for the visually

Date: March 12, 2019	Signature:
Name: Polly Zehm	Golly Zehm
Title: Deputy Director	Je of Jeron